

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,832	05/23/2001		Arvind Raman	PU61	8978
	7590	09/16/2002			
Mr. Edward J		•	EXAMINER MEDLEY, PETER M		
Walnut Woods 5955 W. Main	Street				
Kalamazoo, MI 49009				ART UNIT PAPER NUME	PAPER NUMBER
				2834	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		nu «						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	09/863,832	RAMAN ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Peter M Medley	2834						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•							
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.							
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	pted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	19(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
 Certified copies of the priority document 	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority document	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).								
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5	5) Notice of Inform	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152)						

Application/Control Number: 09/863,832

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, it is not clear what the second piezoelectric sensing element is coupled to. In claims 1 and 11, it is not clear to what the feedback is being provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al.

With respect to claims 1-4 and 11-14, in **fig. 2** the reference discloses a first **30a** and a second **28a** piezoelectric elements on a movable member **20**. It is the Examiner's position that any fluid parameter would necessarily affect the motion of the movable member **20** and thus necessarily affect the feedback **37**. The method is necessitated by the structure.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, the movable member 20 is a flexible blade.

Application/Control Number: 09/863,832

Art Unit: 2834

With respect to claims 8, 9, and 16, the reference discloses a controller and a power source in **fig. 2**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 5 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al.

In **fig. 2** the reference discloses a first **30a** and a second **28a** piezoelectric elements on a movable member **20**. It is the Examiner's position that any fluid parameter would necessarily affect the motion of the movable member **20** and thus necessarily affect the feedback **37**. The method is necessitated by the structure.

The reference does not disclose that the use of two different piezoelectric materials.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that the properties, electrical and mechanical, of a variety of piezoelectric material would have been known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use two different material in the device of Yamada et al for the purpose of obtaining different mechanical responses from the movable member 20. Further, two different piezoelectric materials would have different coefficients of thermal expansion.

Art Unit: 2834

Page 4

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter M Medley whose telephone number is 703-305-0494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3432 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

PM September 10, 2002 NESTOR PAMIREZ
SUBTECHSORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800